REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 15, 17, and 18 are amended. Support for the amendment can be found at least at page 8, lines 11-15, page 9, lines 15-16, and page 9, line 23 to page 10, line 5 of the specification. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 6, 9, and 15 are objected to because of informalities. Claims 6, 9, and 15 have been amended to correct the informalities. Withdrawal of the claim objections is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,664,978 to Kekic (hereafter Kekic) in view of U.S. Patent 6,643,650 to Slaughter (hereafter Slaughter). The Office Action asserts on page 3 that "Slaughter teaches ... rebinding the parent process with an active remote method invocation process when the thread determines that its parent process is not bound with an active remote method invocation process (col. 3 lines 6-15; col. 26 line 61 – col. 27, line 2; col. 30 lines 23-49." The Office Action further asserts, with respect to claims 3 and 15, that "Kekic teaches ... performing a list call to an active remote method invocation process to determine whether the parent process is bound to an active remote method invocation process (col.58 line 64 – col. 59 line 16)." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kekic is directed to a client-server network management system that includes a plurality of managed computer network elements, a managed element server that executes on a first computer; and at least one managed element server client that typically executes on a second computer. Slaughter is directed to a system and method for searching for documents within spaces in a distributed computing environment.

With respect to the "rebinding" step, the only paragraph in Slaughter that mentions "rebinding" is the paragraph starting at column 26, line 61:

> Thus, a gate name 150 provides a flexible mechanism by which to address a message endpoint in the distributed computing environment. A gate name may be used to locate and/or address a gate over a wide range of networks, from a local network to the Internet. Gate names may be independent of message transport so that a message endpoint (gate) may be moved from transport to transport by unbinding and <u>rebinding</u> to different underlying transport addresses (e.g. IP/Port address pairs).

(Emphasis added). However, Slaughter does not disclose or suggest rebinding <u>when</u> the thread <u>determines that its parent process is not bound with an active RMI process</u>. There is no such determination step in Slaughter's system.

With respect to Kekic's teaching at column 58, line 64 to column 59, line 16, Kekic recites as follows:

> Class RMIReference is a singleton class which provides access to the server side objects through RMI. When class RMIReference is instantiated, a call is made to method bind ( ) which in turn uses method lookup ( ) of class JA VA.rmi.Naming to get a reference to a netprism.client.ServerConnect object based on the URL of the server machine and port number. <u>This results in establishment of the RMI connection.</u>

> For a client session to begin, a server reference is needed. Method getServerRef ( ) of class RMIReference uses method ServerConnect login ( ), which on successful completion, returns a Server object reference. The complement of method getServerRef ( ) is method releaseServerRef ( ) which invokes method ServerConnect logOff ( ). The Server object in turn gives access to Builder and Manager objects through accessor methods getBuilder ( ) and getManager ( ). Class RMI Reference provides the client with a gateway to server side objects through the use of the ServerConnect, Server, Builder, and Manager objects.

(Emphasis added). As clearly shown, Kekic's system makes a call to method bind () to get a reference to an object based on the URL of the server is <u>in order to establish the RMI connection</u>. This call is <u>not</u> made to <u>determine whether the parent process is bound to an active RMI process</u>. Kekic simply does not teach or suggest monitoring whether the parent process is bound to an active RMI process, let alone recovering error by rebinding the parent process with an active RMI process.

Therefore, Kekic and Slaughter, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest "[a] method of error recovery of a remote method invocation (RMI) process ... comprising ... <u>determining if the RMI process is bound with the parent process</u> ... including: obtaining a bound uniform resource locator (URL) list from the RMI process; and determining whether the parent process's name is in the bound URL list of the RMI process; and <u>rebinding</u> the parent process with an active RMI process <u>when the thread determines that its parent process is not bound with an active RMI process</u>," as recited in amended claim 1 (emphasis added). Claim 1 is amended to more precisely recite the features of the invention. Since the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the elements of amended claim 1, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-8 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite.

With respect to claim 9, for the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1, Kekic and Slaughter, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest "determining if the RMI process is bound with the parent process ... including: obtaining a bound uniform resource locator (URL) list from the RMI process; and determining whether the parent process's name is in the bound URL list of the RMI process; and rebinding the at least one management process with an active RMI process when the thread determines that the at least one management process is not bound with an active RMI process," as recited in amended claim 9 (emphasis added). Therefore, claim 9 is allowable.

Claims 10-12 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 9 and for the additional features they recite.

With respect to claim 15, for the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1, Kekic and Slaughter, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest "[a] method of error recovery of a remote method invocation (RMI) process ... comprising ... performing a list call to an active RMI process to determine whether the parent process is bound with the RMI process, the list call obtains a bound uniform resource locator (URL) list from the RMI process and determines whether the parent process's name is in the bound URL list of the RMI process ... performing a rebind call to an active RMI process if the thread determines that the parent process is not bound with an active RMI process," as recited in amended claim 15. Therefore, claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 16-19 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 15 and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (A) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **November 1, 2004**

Kelly T. Lee
Registration No. 47,743
Andrews Kurth LLP
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. (202) 662-2736
Fax (202) 662-2739